

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Potent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Alexandria, Vizinia 22313-1450 www.united.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/695,408	10/28/2003	Venkat Rangan	112-0122US	5639	
<sup>29855</sup> 7590 12/20/2006 WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P.			EXAMINER		
			SUN, SCOTT C		
20333 SH 249 SUITE 600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
HOUSTON, TX 77070			2182		
	•	·	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/20/2006	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/695,408	RANGAN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Scott Sun	2182	

		1	
	Scott Sun	2182	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 01 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, af tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
<ul><li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or</li></ul>	tter form for appeal by materially re	aucing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li></ol>	:		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	·	•	_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			٠
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	t done NOT slave the application i	n condition for Allows	naa baaayaay
<ul> <li>11.  ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.</li> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> </ul>		n condition terrallowal	nce because:
13. Other:	( 5.65.66) Fupor (10(6).	A	
		//	
		KIM HUYNH	
	SUPÉR	VISORY PATENT E	
	<del></del>	12/11/0	6

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

/ / Part of Paper No. 20061214 Application/Control Number: 10/695,408 Page 2

Art Unit: 2182

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/1/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments are summarized as:

- a. Regarding claim 19, prior art of record does not disclose the I/O module including the required processors.
- b. Regarding claim 19, prior art of record, Testardi, does not disclose the storage devices can be connected through a switch and have the data migration processing still be operational.
- c. Regarding claim 21, prior art of record does not teach any processors delaying the operations, but instead teaches that the fast path, which cannot be equated to the required processors, delaying the operations.
- 2. In response to argument 'a', examiner notes that the final action indicated the I/O module contains the various logic elements (302, 304, 306, 320, 322, 324; figure 3A), all of which are the required processors. Edsall teaches that these logic units receive, operate on, and transmit network traffic (paragraph 53). Edsall also teaches "a multiport switch will have virtualization logic separately implemented on one or more of its ports... rather than having centralized processing for all ports of a switch" (paragraphs 40-41).

Examiner further notes that the final office action states that Edsall does not disclose explicitly a <u>control module</u>, which prior art of record, Testardi, subsequently

teaches. There is no indication in the final office action that Edsall does not teach the processors in the I/O module.

3. Regarding argument 'b', examiner notes that the claim language merely states that the storage units "may" be coupled to the storage processing device through a switch, or alternatively, "may" be directly coupled to the storage processing device. There is no requirement that both of these conditions have to be met, as the claim states them in the alternative. Furthermore, there is requirement that any of them have to be met, as the claim also states that the respective coupling "may", but are not required, to occur.

Even if assuming that applicant states that both conditions must be satisfied, examiner notes that prior art of record, Testardi, teaches that "some or all of the connections by which the hosts, data managements system and data storage system may be connected to the communication medium may pass through other communication devices, such as a Fibre Channel switch, or other switching equipment" (paragraph 56). This teaching is contrary to applicant's assertion that "there is no teaching or suggestion in Testardi that the storage units can be connected to the storage processing device through a switch".

4. Regarding argument 'c', examiner notes that the "fast-path" is merely a term which prior art of record, Testardi, uses to refer to the hardware/software that perform operations that are relatively fast. Testardi teaches that, "The FP is a streamlined implementation of hardware and/or software that may be used in connection with optimizing and performing a portion of I/O operations" (paragraph 73). This is contrary

Page 4

Art Unit: 2182

to applicant's assertion that "in Testardi the fast path does nothing, not delay, not handle, nothing", and is not a processor.

5. Having responded to each of applicant's arguments, examiner notes that previous grounds of rejection are still valid. The request for reconsideration does not place the application in condition for allowance.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Sun whose telephone number is (571) 272-2675. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 10:30am-7pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim N. Huynh can be reached on (571) 272-4147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.